

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 21:15:19 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #260
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 26 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 260

Today's Topics:

 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs. (2 msgs)
 ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)
Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.
 Stereotypes and Code (was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (2 msgs)
 U.S. upgrades /AG /AA etc?
 Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !! (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 93 03:44:03 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!
cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Daignan) writes:

> Despite the impression some people receive from my postings, I really am
> in favor on a codeless license. However, I felt that the current
> codeless license was implemented incorrect.
>
> For example, people claim that the codeless tech license was designed to
> increase the amateur population, and swell unused bands with new blood,
> thus saving our bandwidth.

>
> However, there is no incentive for people to operate on those bands. A
> codeless tech is, by default, going to operate on 2 meters, its the most
> crowded, popular band (yes, with exceptions, I'm sure).
>
> If people were so damn concerned about preserving bandwidth, why didn't
> they give codeless techs access only to those bands that needed additional
> utilization, and save the existing, crowded UHF/VHF bands for those that
> decided to upgrade? After all, isn't that what incentive licensing is
> supposed to be for? What better way to protect bandwidth by flooding
> underused bands with new, codeless techs?

Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

Ten Forty Roger, and all those Good Numbers!

--Robert

Date: 25 Jul 93 18:13:59 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Daignan) writes:

> Unfortunately, in this area, most of the codeless techs I have met are
> true CB transplants. Its even gotten to the point where the local Ham
> club now has "coffee breaks" every other month. Every day listening to
> 2 meters yields a new chuckler: "You have a super-fine-one, ya hear?"
> "I'm going to stop by your 20, after I stop to get some Motion-Lotion
> Potion." "Want me to pick up some Mocha-Java on the way over?"
>
> Then, I could tell you the story of the no-clue who came on simplex one
> evening when I was talking with a few friends and told me how I "should
> be talking on a repeater because someone might be able to learn something
> from the conversation". Obviously, he forgot about how repeaters should
> only be used if two stations can't communicate simplex, so we taught him.

Memorables from the Cranston, RI 146.700- repeater:

"You sicken me."
"Oh yeah, well you're an asshole."
"Kilo Delta One Hotel _____ listening on 10 70"
"N1LVU N1LVU this is N1KRM"

Then lets see, there're the autopatches to arrange visitation rights, to see who wants what for dinner. Who's talking about what check came in, or what Sgt. called... it's really quite funny. And Mike isn't kidding about the "I gotta back on outta here", we heard it yesterday afternoon.

Then there's the bottom feeding scum who supposedly fell down the stairs of his apartment building and is sueing the landlord and bragging about it on the air how he's gonna buy a new FT-1000D, and all these goodies with the settlement money. Jeez..

But the best one, by far, is the courtesy tone. There are STILL people out there who don't know what the tone is for. Interesting.....

Tony

```
-----
      o      o  Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      /  system @ garlic.sbs.com                      Soon W5YI VE
      \____/
      (oo)      Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  ____  \|
 / | {MTV}||   MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* ||{____}||
  ||-----||   (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^          ^^
-----
```

Date: 26 Jul 93 18:35:25 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jon,

is the ARRL considering providing an ftp archive for ham radio related software ?

As things stand now, there are lots of different places one can find (or put ...) various software packages related to ham radio. Were the ARRL to provide a common meeting place for all such software, it might prove a large benefit.

If not an archive, how about a directory of other archives?

In article <1823@arrl.org>, jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

|> In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:
|> >Well, stop taking it out of "the back pockets" of ARRL members. As quite
|> >a few of us have seen, the ARRL is now connected to the Internet. Drop
|> >the DIRECT connection, and save several thousand dollars a month.
|>
|> Well. This is the first time we've been dinged for being *too well*
|> connected to the Internet. Congratulations! You win the award for
|> coming up with a new complaint.
|>
|> In fact, we pay something in the neighborhood of \$2000 *per year* for
|> our dial-up connection. *I* feel that the additional service we are
|> able to provide to our members is more than worth that amount.
|>
|> >That's meant more of a poke in the side than anything. But it cues a
|> >question, Why is the ARRL online? Why not just hookup to a mail/usenet
|> >server.
|>
|> We used to be connected through a uucp connection to a local university.
|> The unreliability of that connection is what drove us to a paid-for
|> connection in the first place.
|>
|> >Is there a possible expansion in mind?
|>
|> We hope to one day provide some FTP access, as well as a better mail
|> connection. We are presently waiting for our service provider to
|> upgrade the capabilities at its Hartford POP. Then we may upgrade
|> the connection somewhat. (No firm decision has been made, though.)
|> -----
|> Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
|> American Radio Relay League |
|> 225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 1993 16:16:03 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.unomaha.edu!cwis!pschleck@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code
vs.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <5FJ97B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

[...]

>> For example, people claim that the codeless tech license was designed to
>> increase the amateur population, and swell unused bands with new blood,
>> thus saving our bandwidth.

>>

>> However, there is no incentive for people to operate on those bands. A
>> codeless tech is, by default, going to operate on 2 meters, its the most
>> crowded, popular band (yes, with exceptions, I'm sure).

>>

>> If people were so damn concerned about preserving bandwidth, why didn't
>> they give codeless techs access only to those bands that needed additional
>> utilization, and save the existing, crowded UHF/VHF bands for those that
>> decided to upgrade? After all, isn't that what incentive licensing is
>> supposed to be for? What better way to protect bandwidth by flooding
>> underused bands with new, codeless techs?

>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

>Ten Forty Roger, and all those Good Numbers!

> --Robert

Isn't it just amazing how some hams will complain about how crowded
"their" bands are, but won't make the switch themselves to 222, 440, and
1296? However, these new and inexperienced no-code Tech's were expected
to chart out new frequency territory all by themselves, frequencies that
experienced hams won't touch yet. "Get 'em out of our way!" is the
rallying cry.

A new class of license will succeed when it doesn't "ghettoize" its
holders onto new frequencies that don't have a strong base of usage.
It is our responsibility to guide and Elmer new hams (What? Elmering
those abhorrent "CB'ers" is beneath you? Poor baby!). More ham
activity WILL cause better usage of the higher bands as soon as we
realize that it's OUR responsibility as experienced amateurs to get off
our butts and set the example by making the move ourselves.

73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

Date: 26 Jul 93 18:06:36 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Stereotypes and Code (was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

As a real honest to goodness OF (age 54, licensed 1953)
perhaps I can comment on this issue:

In article <CAMxB3.9F3@news.iastate.edu>, wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)
writes:

|> I'm sorry to say this, but I have gotten really discouraged with this
|> newsgroup lately. In reading over some of the latest BS about code vs.
|> no-code, I have seen just how *stupid* people can get.
|>

Second this! Don't people go to SCHOOL any more?
Used to be the case that folks learned to read, write,
spell, etc. before they got their license.

|> I am sick and tired of reading how the "no-clues are ruining ham radio" and
|> how the "OFs are elitist." Many people seem to think *all* co-code Techs are
|> CB-implants, and also that every General/Advanced/Extra Class ham is against
|> the no-code license. This isn't true. If you truly feel something needs to
|> be done about some policy, go try to change it (within the system). Please
|> don't complain to everyone on the net that you are being oppressed.
|>

Code? No-Code (doesn't "no-code" just mean "uneducated"? i.e.
"Not learned how to use this method of communication yet."?)

|> Also, I would hazard to guess that most of the really-OFs are not against
|> no-codes. From my (limited) experience, I've seen most of them (licensed
|> prior to 1960) have seen enough changes that they do not see this as anything
|> new.
|>

You think the code wars were a fuss, you should have seen the
AM vs. SSB wars, or the FM vs. AM wars, or the "I will NEVER
give up my spark rig" wars. This has been mild.

|>
|> --
|> Will Turner, NORDV -----
|> wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
|> twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
|> TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

Date: 26 Jul 93 20:33:52 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!hayward@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22pn2h\$40j@techbook.techbook.com> genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Welford) writes:

:Tom Bodoh (bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov) wrote:

:
:
:

:One area I would like detailed is EXACTLY what they must do to each
:application before forwarding it to the FCC.

:

:The 610 and all the tests are filled out when they get them, as far as I can
:tell. There must be something that is not obvious that they do.

:

:What is it, And why can W5YI complete the same function so much more
:efficiently?

:

W5YI and the ARRL VEC are very different in regard to how they handle
the backup paperwork. W5YI has the local examiner team keep the exams;
the ARRL has all of it forwarded to Newington where, as Bart
explained, they go over it with a fine tooth comb, and then they file
it in case anyone complains.

So, why is W5YI faster? Because they take the 610, make certain that
the top is filled out correctly, stamp it and send it to the FCC.

Why is the ARRL slower? They do a more thorough job and retain the
paperwork. Now, is one approach right and one wrong?

Of course not.

They are just different.

Kristin Rachael Hayward

--

Kristin Rachael Hayward University of Maine WX9T
kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu (yes, I know I didn't post from there)

Date: 26 Jul 93 08:47:18 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, rnimtz@shakespeare.helios.nd.edu (richard nimtz) writes:

>In article <1786@arrl.org> bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes:

>>

>>And yes, each answer sheet, code copy sheet, 610, CSCE (previous and current),
>>and any other document(s) for each applicant are reviewed. Nearly each
>>license copy has to be trimmed and attached to the 610, as the FCC requires.

>

^^

>What size does the license copy have to be trimmed to?

To the border of the pocket or certificate sized license (where it states to "cut along this line").

Thanks...

73,

Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM
Manager
ARRL/VEC

Date: 25 Jul 93 18:18:23 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: U.S. upgrades /AG /AA etc?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

hardie@herald.usask.ca (Peter Hardie) writes:

>

> Could someone send me a list of all the U.S. license upgrade indications that
> are used and what they mean?

> Thanks.

> Pete hardie@herald.usask.ca VE5VA

/KT Tech upgrade
/AG General upgrade
/AA Advanced upgrade
/AE Extra upgrade

```
-----  
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com                      Soon W5YI VE  
      \____/   
      (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
  / | \____ \ /   
 / | {MTV} | | MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's  
* | | {___} | |   
  | | ----- | | (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
  ^^      ^^   
-----
```

Date: 26 Jul 93 19:17:50 GMT
From: ogicse!news.tek.com!tekgen!bruce@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Here in Washington County Oregon, the County Commissioners are in the process of passing Ordinance 414 which will require fees for ALL amateur antennas. The fees range from \$25 to \$1250 depending on antenna type. Towers will require a 100% setback. Towers will be limited to 100 feet tall in urban areas and 150 feet in rural.

Stan, W7NI (503 649-0837), Bob AI7B (503 628-8873) and Greg, W7AGQ have taken it upon themselves to organize a defense. This includes hiring a lawyer and using PRB-1. For more details, call them.

If you would like to help, you might consider sending a FAX to the Washington County Commissioners stating your opposition.

Please, be polite, be brief, and identify yourself.

The intent is not to harass them, but to let them know that a lot of people (both in and out of county) don't agree with this kind of legislation.

Their FAX number is: 503 693 4545

Even if you do not live in Washington County, you might consider sending a FAX. Your county could be next !!

The next hearing on this issue is Tuesday, July 27 6:30 pm
Washington County Public Service Building
155 North First Ave. Hillsboro, OR 97124

Bruce Cheney NI7M

Date: 26 Jul 93 20:41:07 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <3465@tekgen.bv.tek.com> brucec@tekgen.bv.tek.com (Bruce Cheney) writes:

>Here in Washington County Oregon, the County Commisioners are in
>the process of passing Ordinance 414 which will require fees for
>ALL amateur antennas. The fees range from \$25 to \$1250 depending
>on antenna type. Towers will require a 100% setback. Towers will
>be limited to 100 feet tall in urban areas and 150 feet in rural.

Question - Are these fees an Annual FEE? If so, what's the justification?

If the fees are one time, how do they compare with other "building permit" fees for such things as sheds, etc. That question is especially relavent to the \$1250 fees.

Are these "county fathers" imposing a similar fee structure for non-amateur antennas (eg. cellular, TV, CB, satellite, etc?)

>Stan, W7NI (503 649-0837), Bob AI7B (503 628-8873) and Greg, W7AGQ
>have taken it upon themselves to organize a defense. This includes
>hiring a lawyer and using PRB-1. For more details, call them.

>

>If you would like to help, you might consider sending a FAX to the
>Washington County Commisioners stating your opposition.

>

>Please, be polite, be brief, and identify yourself.

>

>The intent is not to harass them, but to let them know that a lot
>of people (both in and out of county) don't agree with this kind
>of legislation.

>

>Their FAX number is: 503 693 4545

>

>Even if you do not live in Washington County, you might consider
>sending a FAX. Your county could be next !!

Or your state.

>The next hearing on this issue is Tuesday, July 27 6:30 pm
>Washington County Public Service Building
>155 North First Ave. Hillsboro, OR 97124
>Bruce Cheney NI7M

Good luck in your opposition,

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 26 Jul 93 18:23:53 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <5FJ97B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
<1993Jul25.155334.14707@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<1993Jul26.003552.3847@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Reply-To : Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com
Subject : Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.

In article <1993Jul26.003552.3847@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu
(Mr. Nice Guy) writes:
|> In article <1993Jul25.155334.14707@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev.
Michael P. Deignan) writes:
|> >robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
|> >
|> >>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
|> >>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
|> >>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.
|> >
|> >Not to actually defend the League (gosh, I wouldn't want people to get the
|> >wrong idea...) but the League's original proposal in 1989 to the FCC for the
|> >codeless license did not grant 2mtr privs to codeless techs, other than
|> >the "data" portion for packet radio use.
|> >
|> >Personally, I would have much rather saw the Codeless Tech license granted
|> >the same privs above 30mhz that Novices are -- with perhaps an additional
|> >band or two to "save that bandwidth".
|> >
|> >M

|>
|> Attn. Rev. turkey there is no license called CodelessTech!!!
|>
|> Why in the hell should I learn 13 wpm Moris to work the satellites?
|>
|> Rev Rod Universal Life Church (I payed \$1 in 1970 for the Rev. part)
|> My rev is just as good as your rev but I an not such a big JERK.
|>

Ho Ho Ha Ha ... giggle giggle ...

|>
|> --
|> Rod Anderson N0NZO | "I do not think the United States government
|> Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
|> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
|> satellite N0NZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.0R.USA.NA

Date: 25 Jul 93 17:58:05 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.192048.28231@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,
<1993Jul24.042735.5428@anomaly.sbs.com>, <CANwn8.Dpz@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

> In article <1993Jul24.042735.5428@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev
> . Michael P. Deignan) writes:
>>
>>Bullshit.
> ^^^^^^^^^
> I've never heard a Reverend say that word before.....

You must lead a sheltered life. I've also heard him use that wonderful
four letter monosyllable that begins with F too.....

BTW, while I don't actively advertise it, I'm:

Bishop Anthony S. Pelliccio (Rev. Deignan is in my diocese)

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
    /|  ____ \
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || {____} ||
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^        ^^
-----
```

Date: 25 Jul 93 18:04:11 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM>,
<1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, <22ovicINNju2@topaz.bds.com>
Subject : Re: ARRL and it's members

ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

> First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights
> as to the ARRL's activities.

That's not neccesarily true. If you're a licensed amateur radio
operator then the ARRL is helping to set policies that will ultimately
affect you.

> People have been bitching about perceived subversion by the ARRL board
> recently and I believe a lot of it's unfounded. The major whine I keep
> hearing is that the ARRL didn't poll it's membership on this and it didn't
> poll it's membership on that. Well, frankly, their last attempt at a poll
> (regarding automatic HF ops) was a miserable failure. They conducted their
> poll, and many people didn't like the results.

Could it be the way the poll was conducted?

> The ARRL is a representative organization. Bitch and moan about it all you
> want, it couldn't operate except as it does. It is not any different than
> any other business or non-profit organization, with the possible exception
> that the bulk of the organization is not paid.

>
> How many of you know who your division director is? Did you read the flyer
> when he was running for office and vote for or against him? I did. Certainl
> y
> top of the list of position items a couple of years before we got no-code
> was whether they supported no-code or not. This was what I based my vote
> on. With directors being elected in half the divisions right now, you've
> got another chance.

I know who the division director is. But I'll tell you, things hit the
fan much more quickly here on Usenet. :)

> Did you communicate with your section leader or director after he was elected
> ?
> The directors addresses (as pointed out already) are in QST every month. I
> regularly bump into our division director at the area hamfests. I find littl
> e
> sympathy for people who claim that these guys are out of touch, who don't bot
> her
> to put forth even putting their ideas to the directors. These guys signed up
> for a lot of uncompensated abuse, they've all got day jobs too, you know.

Section Manager? Are you serious? The guy who blows off an engagement to
speak at a club meeting, the guy who never answers his mail, the same
guy who fails to submit section news? Sorry, but come time for him to be
re-elected I'd like to see his butt get tossed.

Tony

```

      o      o  Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      /  system @ garlic.sbs.com                      Soon W5YI VE
      \__/_/
    _____(oo)  Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
   /|  ___  \_/
  / | {MTV} ||      MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
*  || {___} ||
   ||-----||      (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
   ^^        ^^
-----

```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #260
